DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 281 95 CE 008 777

AUTHOR Hoyt, Kenneth
TITLE Teachers and Career Education. Monographs on Career Education.
INSTITUTION Office of Career Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 40p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Higher Education; Learning Processes; Program Development; Program Evaluation; Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Education; Teacher Influence; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

The set of papers included in this monograph is intended to provide a conceptual framework for viewing examples of actual implementation of career education in the classroom. These papers emphasize the key importance of the classroom teacher to the career education effort. Characteristics of today's "good" teacher are discussed in the first paper in terms of value systems. The second paper examines career education and the teaching/learning process under four topics: (1) The rationale for career education in the classroom, (2) use of career implications of subject matter as motivational devices, (3) implications of expanding the parameters of the teaching/learning process, and (4) implications of career education for the philosophy of teaching. The third paper concerns the evaluation of career education and implications for instruction at the elementary school level. The problem of career education as a vehicle for change in teacher education programs is addressed in the last paper. The concluding section of the monograph discusses four assumptions which have implications for teacher education institutions in adopting positions and taking action regarding career education. (TA)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131281

HEW Publication No. (OE)

MONOGRAPHS ON CAREER EDUCATION

TEACHERS AND CAREER EDUCATION

by

Kenneth Hoyt, *Director*
Office of Career Education
Office of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OE 0087777

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
David Mathews, *Secretary*
Virginia Y. Trotter, *Assistant Secretary for Education*

Office of Education
Edward Aguirre, *Commissioner*

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1978

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price: 70 cents
Stock Number 017-080-01618-4
There is a minimum charge of $1.00 for each mail order

3

PREFACE

Recently, the Office of Career Education, USOE, published a monograph entitled "K-12 Classroom Teachers and Career Education: The Beautiful People." That monograph, based on advice and examples provided by classroom teachers, contains specific examples of ways in which teachers are implementing career education in the classroom. The set of papers included here is intended to provide a conceptual framework for viewing such examples of actual practices.

These papers attempt to emphasize the key and crucial importance of the classroom teacher to the career education effort. In spite of attempts to picture career education as a "collaborative" effort, there is no doubt that, among all the actors involved, the key and pivotal person is the classroom teacher.

In many ways, the thoughts and suggestions found in these papers are idealistic in that they do not represent action of many of today's teachers. This is often so, not because teachers may disagree with the idealism being expressed, but rather simply because of practical constraints placed on teachers in many school systems. The idealism reflected in this set of papers will hopefully be viewed as a goal to be sought. We are well aware of the fact that it will not be an easy goal to attain.

The last of these papers addressed the critical problem of career education as a vehicle for change in teacher education programs. The recent AIR national survey of career education produced clear evidence that career education has not yet made a significant impact on more than a small percentage of teacher education institutions. Hopefully, this paper may perhaps serve as a forum for beginning debate among faculty members in teacher education settings regarding the implications career education holds for changes in their operations. This paper has purposely been placed at the end of the set in hopes that the other three papers will first be considered.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	iii
Who is a "Good" Teacher Today?	1
Career Education and the Teaching/Learning Process	8
Evaluation of Career Education: Implications for Instruction at the Elementary School Level	15
Career Education and Teacher Education	24
Bibliography	35

WHO IS A "GOOD" TEACHER TODAY?

The question, "Who is a good teacher?" is as old as education itself. Philosophical discussions, surveys, evaluation efforts, and research studies centering around this question have been voluminous and are still continuing. The degree to which their results could be said to constitute conclusive evidence is much more a function of personal bias than of any absolute truths that were discovered. I have no illusions that these remarks either can or will change this situation.

Our continuing inability to provide a clear and universally satisfying answer to this question does not stem from any lack of interest, research "know-how," intellectual capability, or concern. Instead, it appears to be due to four complicating conditions which, in combination, make it impossible to arrive at any universally acceptable answer to the question. First, to answer the question "Who is a good teacher?" it seems obvious that we must add the further question "for which student?" That is, the answer given for the teacher of a mentally handicapped third grade student from an affluent neighborhood would certainly differ, if answered in specific terms, from that given for a gifted graduate student in an inner city university setting.

Second, it is complicated by temporal constraints. An answer appropriate to give 50 years ago would differ considerably from an appropriate answer today. Fifty years from now, still a different answer will undoubtedly be appropriate. To recognize this is simply to acknowledge that education is an instrument of society and must be responsive to societal changes.

Third, it is complicated by the fact that the question "Who is a good teacher?" differs considerably from the question "What is good teaching?" The latter question is properly answered using learner outcomes as prime criterion measures while the former question must be answered using other criteria. This, of course, is due to the fact that a wide variety of teaching conditions, over and beyond the personal qualities and academic qualifications of the teacher, enter into the picture when learner outcomes are used as a primary criterion for answering the question.

Fourth, it is complicated by the personal value systems of those who ask the question "Who is a good teacher?" We have all seen some school principals who answer the question operationally by assessing how quiet students remain in the classroom and how seldom students are sent to the principal's office. Others answer in terms of how much students seem to like their teacher. Still others insist on answering the question only in terms of increases in student academic achievement. Some, of course, insist on various combinations of these and other things when they seek answers to this question. The point to be recognized is

simply that personal value systems are involved and it is obviously impossible to *prove* that one personal value system is superior to another.

The generic nature of this topic prevents me from taking either the first or the third of these complicating conditions into account. At the same time, it forces me to orient these remarks around the second and the fourth. That is, the only way I can speak here in attempting to answer the question "Who is a good teacher today?" is to reveal my own personal value system. As of today I am prepared to do so if you are willing to acknowledge that I am not asking you to change your personal value system nor to necessarily agree with mine.

The remainder of these remarks will be devoted to brief comments regarding five elements in my personal value system that I use in answering this question for myself. I present them as only the personal values and beliefs that they are.

A Good Teacher is Intellectually Competent and Substantively Committed

First, I believe a good teacher is intellectually competent and substantively committed. The desire to learn, in the absence of ability to learn, is a laudable but insufficient teacher characteristic. Surely, most will agree that one requisite for communicating substantive content to others is that one possesses some substantive content for use in communication. Because I value the desire to learn so much, I oppose setting minimal levels of academic aptitude as a selection criterion for use in teacher education institutions. I firmly believe in the right of individuals to try. I also believe that sizeable cultural bias exists in most academic aptitude measures now in common use. Thus, I would set no minimal academic floor. At the same time, I would insist on demonstration of the degree to which the teacher has mastered the substantive content of the subject or subjects to be taught.

In addition, it seems important to me that the teacher demonstrate his or her interest in and commitment to substantive content through continuing efforts to learn more of this content. A good teacher is, in my opinion, also an eager learner. The current and continuing knowledge explosion will make this characteristic even more important in the future than it has been in the past. The good teacher will demonstrate this quality in one or several possible ways—including independent study, participation in professional associations, changing lesson plans, and enrolling in further courses as a student.

Some students can and do learn, of course, in spite of the teacher. For most students, however, I am firmly convinced that, if the teacher is not knowledgeable and excited about some body of substantive content, it will be unlikely that students will gain much knowledge or acquire much interest in that content.

A Good Teacher is Concerned About the Need for Students to Learn Substance

Second, I believe a good teacher is perpetually concerned about the need for students to learn that substantive content the teacher seeks to impart. To me, the word "teacher" is a very special one quite different in meaning from the word "instructor." An instructor, in my mind, is simply a person charged with imparting substantive content to others. A teacher, on the other hand, is, in addition to responsibility for imparting content, also charged with helping students learn why it is important that they learn that content.

When a student remarks that "this teacher makes the subject interesting," it is primarily this quality to which the student refers. At its root, this quality is based on a philosophical belief that the purpose of education cannot be simply education. Rather, the purpose of education must be *preparation* for something. It is obvious that many apparently do not subscribe to this philosophical belief. I have had many university colleagues, over the years, who firmly believe that it is none of their business nor is it proper for them to inquire what a given student might do with the knowledge acquired in a given class. Such persons support an opposing philosophy that contends the best, and primary, reason for imparting knowledge to others is because that knowledge exists. They would argue that, since they have no way of knowing the almost infinite variety of ways in which such knowledge could be put to use, it is impractical and, in a sense, immoral, to suggest any. While I can respect such a point of view, I cannot agree with it.

In my opinion, every student has a right to know why it is important to learn that content the teacher is attempting to teach. For some students, it may be enough to know that the content exists and they do not yet understand it. For other students, it may be enough to know that they will need to understand this content as a prerequisite for understanding additional content to be learned in future years. For many students, however, reasons for learning content related to lifestyle utility are essential to understand if the student is to be motivated toward trying to master the content. When these students are ignored, the absence of both true "teachers" and of true "learners" becomes immediately and painfully obvious.

Over the years, many distinguished commissions and individuals have sought to specify the goals and purposes of American education. Typical goals have included, for example, such things as helping students learn: (a) to appreciate cultural opportunities; (b) to make wise use of leisure time; (c) to prepare themselves for entry into the world of paid employment; (d) to ensure the physical and mental health development of students; (e) to prepare students for change; and (f) to help students exercise the rights and accept the responsibilities of citizenship. Such goals, since they are stated in very broad terms, are intended to have applicability at all levels of education and in all educational settings. When combined with cognitive goals derived from the substantive content itself,

they are said to constitute a set of reasons for existence of our nation's system of formal education.

A good teacher, in my opinion, is one who consciously and conscientiously uses one or more of these broad goals of American education as a means of answering the student's question "Why should I learn this?" Unless these goals are emphasized in the classroom, they are empty words devoid of meaning or purpose. Unless school makes sense to students, it may be senseless for them to continue to try to learn.

A Good Teacher is Concerned About Personal Stimulation and Autonomy

Third, I believe a good teacher is concerned about her or his own personal needs for professional stimulation and professional autonomy. Further, I believe the good teacher is similarly concerned about the student's need for personal stimulation and personal autonomy.

This concern grows out of the "education factory" we have created that today operates as our system of public education. In my opinion, educators have as much right to be concerned about the dehumanizing effects of the "educational assembly line" as industrial workers are about the assembly lines on which they work. The system of grade levels, of grading practices, of worshipping time (as expressed through Carnegie unit) as a prime method for assessing educational accomplishment, and an over concern on "scope and sequence" problems in American education have contributed greatly to this concern.

In my opinion, educators could learn much related to desirable changes in the educational system from studying research related to reducing worker alienation in the business-labor-industry community. Procedures for reducing worker alienation that result in higher productivity include: (1) providing greater variety in work assignments; (2) providing greater freedom to vary work procedures and techniques; (3) providing greater opportunity for worker interaction; and (4) providing workers greater ability to participate in policy and management decisions. I have a distinct feeling that worker alienation is a phenomenon affecting both teachers and students in many of today's classrooms. We have often emphasized that school makes little sense to many students. We have failed to emphasize enough that it makes little sense to many teachers also.

If we could reduce worker alienation among both teachers and students, it seems logical to expect that educational productivity would increase. A good teacher, in my opinion, is interested enough in this problem to take some positive actions toward solving it. I am absolutely convinced that both teachers and students are smarter, more innovative, and more creative than our current

rigidly structured system of education allows them to be. Good teachers, I think, should and do work on this problem.

In many ways, current efforts to respond to the demand for accountability in education are counter productive to encouraging this essential teacher quality. Do not misunderstand me. I am not opposed to accountability. I *am* opposed to mechanistic ways of measuring it that impede teacher creativity and professional judgement. The good teacher has always worried about accountability and accepted it as a personal and professional responsibility. To have any rigid system of accountability imposed on the teacher is to deny the teacher's need for professional autonomy.

If formal accountability systems in education are to be justified today, it seems to me their justification must be predicated on the assumption of the presence of poor teachers. I personally oppose the notion of establishing major educational policies on the basis of this negative assumption.

A Good Teacher Worships How Much Students Learn—Not How Much Credit The Teacher Receives

Fourth, I believe that a good teacher will value more highly how much the student learns than how much credit the teacher receives for helping the student learn. It is becoming increasingly obvious that students can and do learn from more persons that teachers, in more places than within a classroom, and in more ways than from books. It seems to me that good teachers recognize, applaud, and take advantage of these facts in planning for and carrying out the teaching-learning process.

The days of educational isolationism are past. So, too, are the days when schooling represented a phase of life reserved only for the young. A good teacher today, in my opinion, is one who is actively working to destroy the false assumption that the best way to prepare students for adult roles in the "real world" is to lock them up in a schoolhouse and keep them away from that world. Instead, I believe good teachers are ones who think of the entire community as a learning laboratory for students. The good teacher is one who values highly the total amount of societally useful learning that accrues to the student and who places a relatively low value on whether or not the teacher is the sole source from whom the student accumulates such knowledge.

Within the school building, a teacher holding such values welcomes, for example, such things as team teaching, projects that involve more than one teacher and one subject, and the use of resource persons from the community as consultants and helpers in the classroom. In addition, the good teacher seeks to identify and utilize student opportunities in the broader community to supplement teacher efforts in the classroom. In saying this, I must make clear

that I am not automatically supporting such departures from tradition as "good things" under any circumstances. Certainly, unless used wisely, they hold fully as much potential for harm as they do for good. Rather, I am trying to say that, in my opinion, the good teacher will recognize the existence of such multiple resources for enhancing student learning and will not allow the personal ego needs of the teacher to stand in the way of trying to use them effectively.

A Good Teacher is Concerned About Helping Each Student Become a Learner

Fifth, and finally, I believe a good teacher values most highly his or her responsibility for making learning become an exciting and valued personal goal of every student. It is clear that, in the past, this quality has been effectively missing in many classrooms. We have all seen pupils entering Kindergarten as eager learners and completely "turned off" to the entire teaching-learning process prior to reaching fourth grade.

This is due, in part, I believe, to the fact that many teachers have emphasized too much how the student has failed to learn and too little of her or his learning successes. We have concentrated relatively too much attention on urging students to do better and relatively too little attention on giving students credit for doing at all. We have emphasized too much how many students exceeded a given student's level of learning and too little the fact that this student has achieved. We have urged our students to try harder rather than giving them credit for having tried at all.

The joy of learning, like most other personal joys, must rest largely on personal recognition of accomplishment on the part of the individual. Most of us discover who we are through what we are able to accomplish. A student who is told he hasn't learned will, if the message is repeated often enough, become a non-learner. Conversely, a student who is given credit for having learned something is likely to be stimulated to try to learn more. The good teacher, in my opinion, recognizes and capitalizes on this fact. It is not a question of helping the student *become* worthwhile, but rather one of recognizing that each *is* worthwhile when he or she comes to the classroom. In short, the good teacher, in my opinion, is one who has confidence in his or her students and passes that confidence on to students through positively reinforcing their accomplishments.

If the joy of learning can be said to be exceeded by any other joy, it seems to me that one such higher order joy must be that which comes when, as a teacher, one recognizes that a student has learned and has an interest in learning. This is a very special kind of joy. It comes often to the good teacher. It is probably unknown to many others.

Concluding Remarks

These, then, are the five elements in my personal value system that I use when someone asks me "Who Is a Good Teacher Today?" I have tried to explain them here, not so you would agree with them, but simply so that you can know about them. I did so in hopes that it would help you think about your value system and the ways in which you would answer this question for yourself. That is, my purpose has been stimulation, not conversion.

There are two emphases that I have purposely tried to avoid. First, I hope it is clear that I have tried to avoid a "walking on water" approach to describing the good teacher. That is, I have not described the good teacher as loyal, trustworthy, honest, neat, kind, considerate, compassionate, nor friendly. Such qualities, while of unquestioned value, are ones which, in all human beings, are sometimes present and sometimes absent in our behavior.

While I am, admittedly, an idealist, I hope that the prime message conveyed here has been one of aspiration, not of expectation. The personal values I have conveyed here are very real and important to me, but I know that I don't always apply them correctly in my own teaching. They represent much more a basis for the way I evaluate myself as a teacher than they do a description of my typical behavior. Teachers are human beings too.

Second, I hope it is clear that, by discussing these values as I have, I have purposely tried to avoid giving those who employ teachers a blueprint for evaluating them. I quite understand that, in these times of a supposed teacher surplus, many are searching for ways of selecting good teachers. Such persons will receive little, if any, help from these remarks. If these remarks are helpful at all, it is my hope that they will be helpful to other teachers who, like myself, are constantly searching for ways we may be able to better serve our students. That is why I have said these words.

CAREER EDUCATION AND THE TEACHING/LEARNING PROCESS

Almost from its inception, career education has been pictured as a collaborative effort involving the formal educational system, the home and family structure, and the business-labor-industry-professional-government community. As it has been conceptualized, important roles and functions have been suggested from personnel from each of these three segments of society. Repeatedly, we have emphasized that, unlike earlier moves toward educational reform, career education is not something that school personnel can do by themselves. Within our system of formal education, we have suggested that all ecucational personnel need to be active participants if career education is to be effective. We have stressed, as strongly as possible, our belief that career education does not represent a function to be assigned to a single individual in the school nor relegated to any particular part of the curriculum.

Career education's cry for collaboration has camouflaged the crucial importance of the classroom teacher to the success of career education. Equally important, it has tended to also camouflage the many and varied implications for change in the teaching/learning process called for by career education. Of all those we ask to become involved in career education, the greatest potential for effectiveness and the greatest challenges for change lie in the teaching/learning process. It is my purpose here to attempt to both defend and explain this contention.

Both the need for and the current status of career education have been discussed repeatedly in the references found at the end of this paper. Both of these topics are, therefore, purposely ignored here. Instead, I would like here to specify the major kinds of changes called for in the teaching/learning process and the key importance of the classroom teacher in effecting such changes. To do so, four topics must each be briefly discussed: (1) The rationale for career education in the classroom; (2) The use of career implications of subject matter as motivational devices; (3) Implications of expanding the parameters of the teaching/learning process; and (4) Implications of career education for the philosophy of teaching.

Before proceeding, two points must be made clear. First, there are many in career education who do not agree with my contention that the classroom teacher is the key person in career education. Second, my thoughts on this topic are still evolving and I will welcome your criticisms and suggestions. Having made these two admissions, let us proceed.

A Rationale For Career Education in the Classroom

Career education seeks to make education, as preparation for work, a major goal of all who teach and of all who learn. To attain this goal, career education

has formulated two broad objectives: (1) to increase relationships between education and work and the ability of individuals to understand and capitalize on these relationships; and (2) to increase the personal meaning and meaningfulness of work in the total lifestyle of each individual. Both of these objectives deserve brief discussion.

Relationships between education and work are, as we all know, becoming closer and closer as we move into the post-industrial-service-information-technological society of today and the foreseeable future. Demand for unskilled labor continues to decline. Demand for persons with specific learned occupational skills continues to increase. The American system of formal education must accept increasing responsibility both for providing individuals with general career skills required for adaptability in our rapidly changing society and with specific career skills that can be utilized in making the transition from school to the world of paid employment. Our students will be unable to take full advantage of these relationships between education and work until and unless they know about them. They will not learn about them if teachers continue to ignore the topic. In essence, this is the rationale behind career education's efforts to attain this first objective.

The second objective—i.e., making work a more meaningful part of the individual's total lifestyle—is considerably more basic to career education's call for change within the classroom. A full discussion of this objective would extend far beyond the classroom and the teaching/learning process. Here, only that part of the rationale that pertains to the classroom itself will be discussed.

In career education, the word "work" is not limited to the world of paid employment outside of formal education. On the contrary, "work" is defined as *"conscious effort, other than that whose primary purpose is either coping or relaxation, aimed at producing benefits for oneself and/or for oneself and others."* Thus, in addition to the world of paid employment, this definition covers the unpaid work of the volunteer, the full-time homemaker, and work in which individuals engage in the productive use of their leisure time. For our purposes here, the prime point I want to emphasize is that *it also includes the work of the student and the work of the teacher.* In the conceptualization of career education, every full-time student has a vocation—e.g., a primary work role—namely, the "vocation" of student. Similarly, every teacher has an occupation—e.g., a primary work role in the world of paid employment—namely, the "occupation" of teacher. We begin with an assumption that both teachers and students supposedly come into the classroom to *work.* (The fact that, in many classrooms, one would have difficulty seeing this assumption being applied makes it no less valid as an assumption.)

In the larger society, positive relationships have been established between productivity (output per person hour) and reduction in worker alienation. There

is every reason to believe that these same kinds of positive relationships can and do exist for the work of the student *and* for the work of the teacher in the classroom. If worker alienation can be reduced among both students and teachers, educational productivity—i.e., increases in academic achievement—should result. Evidence justifying this reasoning has already been accumulated in career education programs operating in such widely diverse places as Hamlin County, West Virginia; Dade County, Florida; Santa Barbara, California; and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

It is no secret that, today, we have many students who are alienated from their work. They don't like to learn in the classrooms they are in. When this happens, we often find teachers who are alienated from *their* work. They don't enjoy teaching. By applying the general principles used in reducing worker alienation to both students and teachers, it seems reasonable to assume that educational productivity will increase.

Common strategies for reducing worker alienation include such strategies as: (a) increasing the variety of work assignments; (b) increasing autonomy of the individual worker; (c) providing workers with perspective regarding the importance of their work; (d) providing workers with more opportunity for closer personal interaction; (e) providing workers rewards for quality work completed on an "on-time" basis; and (f) encouraging workers to use their own creativity and ingenuity in devising ways of attaining desired outcomes. It should be immediately apparent, to those who have studied the literature of career education, that many of the classroom strategies and methods proposed by career education are directly aimed at reducing worker alienation among both students and among teachers.

In career education, we are trying to get away from the educational "assembly line" that finds persons going to school simply so that they can go on to more schooling. We are trying to free both teachers and students to be as innovative and as creative as we believe they really are. We want both students and teachers to gain personal meaning and meaningfulness from their work. We do so in order that student achievement can be increased.

The Use of Career Implications of Subject Matter as Motivational Devices

In my opinion, an "instructor" is one who imparts subject matter to students. On the other hand, a "teacher is one who, in addition to a concern for imparting subject matter, is also concerned with helping students understand reasons why it is important to learn the subject matter. Career education emphasizes education as preparation for work. In doing so, we have contended that *one* of the reasons students go to school is so they can engage in work after leaving the formal educational system. If teachers can show students how the subject matter relates to work that the student may some day choose to do, we have assumed

that students may be motivated to learn more subject matter. The career implications of subject matter represent a source of educational motivation that should apply to *all* of the students *some* of the time. It may apply to *some* of the students almost all of the time. If "career" is defined as "the totality of work one does in her or his lifetime" and, if "work" includes unpaid activities as well as the world of paid employment, it would seem that career implications exist for every subject. For almost all subjects, career implications exist pertaining to the world of paid employment. In others, the majority of career implications pertain to the work individuals may choose to do in the productive use of leisure time. It is important and appropriate that both kinds of career implications be made clear to students.

Two additional observations are equally important to emphasize here. First, education, as preparation for work, represents only *one among several* basic and fundamental goals of American Education. Thus, the use of career implications of subject matter as a source of educational motivation should be thought of as only one of a variety of ways in which teachers seek to help students find a sense of purpose and purposefulness in learning subject matter. Second, and related to the first, the presence of multiple goals for American Education make it obvious that, when one considers all that is taught in classrooms, large segments are taught for purposes of attaining other worthy goals of American Education and so have no direct career implications whatsoever.

I am always distressed when, in effect, a teacher apologizes to me for not stressing career implications of subject matter while I am observing a class. Sometimes there are none. The worst thing we could do is to attempt to fabricate career implications. All we have ever said to teachers is to try to emphasize career implications, where they exist, as *one* source of educational motivation. We are not trying to take time away from imparting subject matter. Rather, we are simply asking teachers to consider using career implications of subject matter, where appropriate, during that time any person who deserves to be called a "teacher" takes to show students why it is important to learn the subject matter.

Implications of Expanding the Parameters of the Teacher/Learning Process

Career education exponents have proclaimed widely their belief that students can learn in more ways than from books, in more settings than the formal classroom, and from more persons than the certified professional teacher. Such pronouncements seem to have startled and upset some teachers. This is most unfortunate. Rather than being, in any way, a threat to the teacher, these pronouncements are intended as ways of expanding the parameters of the teaching/learning process and so to increase the variety of options open to the teacher along with opportunities for the exercise of teacher innovativeness and

creativity. No one, so far as I know, is talking about replacing either teachers or classrooms. I think we know better than to try that.

We are saying that it is time we rid ourselves of the false assumption that the best way to ready students for the real world is to lock them up in a classroom and keep them away from that world. We are saying that many learning opportunities exist in the broader community outside of the classroom and that, if we make provisions for our students to learn in that broader community as well as in the classroom, perhaps our students would learn more. We are saying that there are persons in every community who, instead of going through the "school of hard books," went through the "school of hard knocks" and that some of what they learned may be valuable for some of our students. We are saying that the use of resource persons in the classroom can *supplement* efforts of the professional teacher *who will also be in that classroom.* We are saying that many instructional materials exist on the broader community that can and should be brought into the classroom and used.

Most important, it seems to me we are saying that our prime concern should center around how much students learn—not on where they learn it, how they learn it, or from whom they learn it. The teacher who uses expansion of student opportunities for learning what the teacher is charged with teaching as a prime criterion for planning the total teaching/learning process will almost surely find that more than the teacher, the student, and the book are involved. One of career education's basic tenets is that the days of education isolationism are past. I would hope we could all understand, accept, and act on that fact.

Implications of Career Education for the Philosophy of Teaching

Finally, I would like to comment briefly on what seem to me to be implications of career education for the philosophy of teaching. Of all I have said here, this topic is bound to raise the most controversy and the most disagreement. Because it seems so important to me, I feel I must try to communicate some of my thinking on this topic to you.

First, I believe career education urges the teacher to emphasize accomplishment—productivity—outcomes for all students. Factors making for productivity have been known for years. They are, in general, referred to as good work habits. They include encouraging each student to try, to do the best she or he can, to finish assignments, to cooperate with others, and to come to the work setting (the classroom) on time. I am one who believes the time has come to re-emphasize the practice of good work habits in the classroom and to reward those students who learn and practice them. If, beginning in the early elementary school, all students could be encouraged to learn and practice good work habits, I firmly believe that fewer complaints would be heard from employers who hire these students after they leave us. I also believe that the

practice of good work habits would enhance educational achievement. I think they should be taught consciously, conscientiously, and proudly.

Second, I believe every student has a right to know why it is important to learn that which the teacher tries to teach. If career implications of such subject matter are not present or not valued, then I believe the teacher has a responsibility for providing other reasons for learning to students. In short, I firmly believe that the purpose of education must extend beyond education itself–that education must be preparation for *something*–for one or more of the life roles the student will play as an adult.

Third, I believe that the teaching/learning process would be more effective if we emphasized *success*, rather than *failure*, to our students. That is, I believe that we have spent far too much time urging our students to do *better* without giving them sufficient credit for what they have already *done*. We have all seen little children beginning school as active learners and completely "turned off" from all attempts to learn prior to reaching the fourth grade. I have a sincere feeling that, in part, this must be caused for many students by teachers who tell them how they failed, what they did wrong, and how other students did better. Career education seeks to help every student understand that he or she *is* someone because they have *done* something. The fact that other students have done more or better, while not unimportant, is irrelevant to the fact that this student has accomplished–has worked. I think students would work harder in the future if we give them credit for the work they have already done.

Finally, I believe that every teacher should be interested in and express interest in career aspirations of students. Years ago, we used to say that "every teacher is a counselor." That phrase tended to disappear from popularity when NDEA brought a rapid increase in professional counselors into our schools. I think it is time that phrase be revived. I think teachers should be concerned about and involved in helping students answer the question "Why should *I* work?" This, of course, is a matter of work values and these will be highly influenced by the culture of the home and family structure of the student. That is why I believe teachers should make conscious efforts to relate more closely and more often with members of the student's family. Problems of both race and sex stereotyping are currently preventing many minority students and many females from considering, let alone choosing, from among the broad range of career options that should be made available to them. Many of these stereotypes are reinforced in the textbooks teachers use in the classroom. If teachers do not take an active interest in solving this problem, I do not believe it will ever be solved.

The emphasis here has, hopefully, been limited to the topic of career education and the teaching/learning process. By so limiting my remarks, I have failed to consider a variety of other topics that I know are of interest to

members of ASCD—including such matters as the year-round school, the open-entry open-exit educational system, performance evaluation dangers of the Carnegie unit, the elimination of tracking in the senior high school, or implications that USOE's 15 occupational clusters hold for curriculum change.

Instead, I have chosen to concentrate on the teacher, the student, and the teaching/learning process. I did so because, in my opinion, unless career education is understood and implemented by classroom teachers, anything else we do in the name of career education will matter very little.

EVALUATION OF CAREER EDUCATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR INSTRUCTION AT THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LEVEL

The birth of a new idea properly precedes its expansion into an educational concept. The formulation of a new concept properly precedes a concern for testing its efficacy. Global evaluation of a concept's efficacy properly precedes the formulation and testing of research hypotheses aimed at discovering optimal means of implementing the concept in educational practice. The critics of a new idea in education typically use, as one weapon, a call for definitive research results even prior to the time the idea has been developed into a tentative concept form. This short set of generalizations could, I believe, be illustrated repeatedly by those who study the history of new ideas in American education. Career Education is only the latest example.

Former USOE Commissioner of Education Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr. first introduced the term "Career Education" in 1971. It is important to note that Dr. Marland introduced an *idea*, not a *concept*. His idea was that the world of schooling needs to be brought into closer relationship with the world of work. In introducing this idea, Marland called for the definition of "career education" to be developed in the hard crucible of educational practice. The *idea* was not new, having been stated as one goal of American education in explicit form by the Morrill Act of 1865. Just prior to Marland's pronouncement, the idea had been well illustrated in books by Venn, (1964), by Pucinski, (1969), and by Rhodes, (1970).

Thus, while the idea was not new, there were two new circumstances surrounding it. The first was the term "career education" used to express the idea. The second was that, for the first time, the idea was being championed by a USOE Commissioner of Education and made a top priority of the United States Office of Education. Bolstered by these two new aspects, the idea attained quick approval and endorsement throughout the land by educators, parents, students, businessmen, and the general public. School systems in all parts of the country adopted policy statements supporting "career education" and initiated efforts to implement such policies. The United States Office of Education earmarked several million dollars to demonstrate the concept.

We were caught in a "chicken or the egg" situation. That is, we were attempting to formulate the conceptualization of career education through attempts to implement the *idea* of relating education and work. The facts used to promote career education pertained much more to the need to relate education and work than to our demonstrated ability to do so. Given the history of new ideas in American education, this should, it seems, be viewed as neither surprising nor necessarily distressing.

The amount of progress made in the name of "career education" over the last four years has been substantial and most encouraging. During this period of time, the "idea" of career education has been effectively converted into a "concept." A multiplicity of methods have been devised and field-tested for the implementation of career education. Public enthusiasm for and acceptance of career education have continued to grow. Now, in 1975, we find ourselves at a point in time when it is appropriate to begin the hard task of evaluating the efficacy of the career education concept. This, of course, is not to say the task of conceptualizing career education has now been completed. Any viable educational concept must be a continually evolving one—and career education must not become an exception. I am only saying that, if one studies the consensus tables that are appended to the current USOE policy paper entitled *An Introduction to Career Education* (USOE, 1975), it seems apparent that consensus has been found for a *current* effort to state the concept of career education.

The purposes of this article are to: (1) provide a short capsule summary of the concept of career education in a form that will hopefully be meaningful to professional persons in elementary education; (2) summarize evaluation criteria now being proposed for career education and identify those that seem most appropriate to use at the elementary school level; (3) illustrate currently available results pertaining to evaluation of career education in elementary schools; and (4) present some brief thoughts regarding our current and future needs for evaluation and research for career education in elementary schools.

The Concept of Career Education

Readers are urged to study carefully the USOE policy paper on career education referred to above. Here, only particular aspects of that paper that pertain specifically to the elementary school will be considered. The following discussion assumes readers to be familiar with the USOE policy paper on career education.

First, it is apparent that career education has been conceptualized around the four letter word "work." The word "work," moreover, has been defined so as to reflect the human need of all human beings to do—to accomplish—to achieve. It is a very humanistic concept indeed. As such, it includes both the world of paid employment and the world of unpaid work—including the work of the volunteer, the full-time home-maker, the *pupil*, and work in which individuals engage in the productive use of leisure time. It is a concept that obviously applies to *all* pupils at all levels of education.

Second, with this definition of "work," career education is clearly a developmental concept beginning in the pre-school years and continuing, for most persons, well into the retirement years. That is why we say Kindergarten is

very late to begin career education. There is no difficulty justifying a strong conceptual case for career education in the elementary school. As a developmental concept, career education has leaned heavily on the process of career development over the life span—including career awareness, motivation, exploration, decisionmaking, preparation, entry, progression, maintenance, and decline. The elementary school years have, in this framework, been singled out for particular attention with reference to career awareness and career motivation.

Third, while career development has been used as the process to illustrate the developmental nature of career education, the teaching-learning process has been the prime vehicle utilized for implementing the concept in the elementary school. Here, the rationale has been taken from efforts to reduce worker alienation in business and industrial settings. Career education has attempted implementation strategies that, hopefully, will reduce worker alienation among *both* pupils *and* teachers in the elementary school classroom. We have assumed that, if this can be accomplished, educational productivity—i.e., pupil achievement—will increase.

Fourth, the prime methodology devised for implementing career education has been that of collaborative relationships among the formal educational system, the business-labor-industry-professional-government community, and the home and family structure. By viewing the total community as a learning laboratory and persons from that community as resources for implementing career education in classrooms under teacher direction, the result has been a vast expansion of means, materials, settings, and resources for making learning more appealing and meaningful to pupils and to teachers alike.

Evaluative Criteria for Career Education in the Elementary School

The USOE policy paper on career education referred to earlier lists nine learner outcomes considered appropriate for use in evaluating career education. Of these, four criteria, while not limited in usefulness to the elementary school, seem particularly appropriate for use at this level.

The first calls for students to be *"competent in the basic academic skills required for adaptability in our rapidly changing society."* At the elementary school level, this can be translated to mean a primary concern for helping pupils learn the basic skills of oral and written communication, of mathematics, and basic science. The importance of this criterion stems from a combination of reasons. One such reason is that employers have complained that youthful job applicants coming to them are often deficient in such skills. A second reason is found by recognizing that, with the current rapidity of occupational change, most persons will be forced to change occupations several times during their adult lives and need these basic skills as a prerequisite for doing so. A third reason is clearly evident when one visits elementary classrooms and finds many pupils who apparently are not sufficiently motivated to acquire these essential

skills. Furthermore, it is not difficult to find teachers whose level of motivation for teaching appears no higher than that of their pupils for learning.

The concept of career education calls for two broad approaches for increasing pupil achievement in the elementary school. The first is to show pupils how adults need and use such skills in the work that they do. The second is to increase the variety of means and settings for use in helping pupils acquire these basic academic skills.

The second criterion, in the USOE policy paper, is stated as *"Equipped with good work habits."* The work habits we refer to are those that, over the ages, have been positively related to productivity—to output per person hour. They include such habits as: (a) coming to work (to school) on time; (b) doing one's best; (c) finishing tasks that are begun; and (d) cooperating with one's fellow workers. Again, we find a situation where employers are asserting that youthful job seekers are coming to them unequipped with such habits. If such habits are to become part of one's lifestyle as an adult, it would help if they were acquired early in life. The concept of career education calls for elementary school teachers to consciously emphasize the importance of good work habits to their pupils and to provide students assistance in and credit for their acquisition. Hopefully, if this occurs, it, too, will contribute to pupil achievement in the classroom. Additionally, it will serve as a valuable adaptability tool to be used in the adult world of rapidly changing occupations.

The third criterion, in the USOE policy paper, is stated as *"Capable of choosing and who have chosen a personally meaningful set of work values that foster in them a desire to work."* In a generic sense, work values can be thought of as the constellation of reasons various individuals give when answering, for themselves, the question "Why should I choose to work?" We clearly want pupils to work in their current vocation—their primary work role—i.e., that of a pupil. Thus, in part, our concern is for providing students with multiple reasons why she or he might choose to master the subject matter we are teaching. Additionally, we seek to help pupils understand the work values—i.e., the personal reasons for choosing to work in particular occupations—on the part of adults now employed in the world of paid employment. That is why, for example, career education elementary school field trips emphasize work, not occupations—the ways in which workers are contributing to society's goals rather than a study of their specific job functions. The worth, value, and dignity of any occupation is brought to that occupation by the human beings doing that work. We seek to help pupils understand and appreciate the worth of workers—with special emphasis on their parents as workers—through helping them understand the many ways in which each worker contributes to society and so receives personal benefits for herself or himself. We *do* want our pupils to want to work.

The fourth criterion considered particularly appropriate at the elementary school level is stated as *"Successful in incorporating work values into their total personal value structure in such a way that they are able to choose what, for them, is a desirable lifestyle."* In seeking to apply this criterion in the evaluation of elementary school career education efforts, we are certainly not thinking of using specific occupational choices as the measuring stick. Rather, we are thinking more of measures that would represent a reduction in both race and sex stereotyping as restrictors on occupations considered for possible choice. Work values, like other personal values, are highly influenced by early life experiences. Our elementary school textbooks have, for years, been filled with examples representing both race and sex stereotyping when occupations are described. To open up full freedom of choice in later years, for both minority persons and for females, demands that these problems be attacked in the elementary school. Further, the wise use of one's leisure time demands that consideration be given to activities which, because they are productive, result in personal satisfaction and a sense of accomplishment for the individual. This, too, is something career education has said should be begun to be communicated to pupils beginning in the early elementary school years. We have reasoned that the best of all possible times to acquaint pupils with the positive connotations of "work" is when, in their own lifestyles, they have difficulty separating it from another four letter word called "play."

Examples of Evaluations of Elementary School Career Education Efforts

Of the four criteria discussed above, the first must, it seems to me, take priority in our attempts to evaluate the effectiveness of career education efforts at the elementary school level. That is, much as parents favor our efforts to increase student understanding of relationships between education and careers, their basic reasons for sending their children to the elementary school are much more directly and immediately related to education than they are to work. Parents, and the general public, want elementary school pupils to learn to read—to perform simple arithmetical operations—to acquire the basic skills of oral and written communication—and to acquire a general understanding of and appreciation for the world in which we all live. If, in the process, they learn something about careers, parents will be pleased, but that is not basically why pupils are sent to the elementary school. No new idea can succeed in education if it fails to recognize the importance of this basic educational function and the responsibility of that new idea for making some positive contribution toward that goal. The old saying that "the tail cannot wag the dog" is appropriate to remember here. Unless career education can demonstrate that, when applied, pupils in elementary schools increase their levels of academic achievement in the basic skills, it will have trouble justifying itself long enough to be concerned about the remaining criteria.

Thus, it is encouraging to find that, among those few career education programs where conscientious attempts have now been made to engage in some form of "product" evaluation, the use of increases in academic achievement has been applied. It is further encouraging to see that, at least with the few examples now available, the results look more positive than negative.

One example is found in a monograph written by Dr. LeVene Olson of Marshall University (1974). Using elementary school pupils in Lincoln County, West Virginia, Olson found, when pupils who had been exposed to a career education effort were compared with another group who had not been so exposed, the "career education" pupils (Grades 1-6) scored 11% higher in language achievement and 24.5% higher on mathematical achievement than did the control group.

Similar kinds of results were reported, in capsule form, by Clifton Purcell of the Santa Barbara, California; career education program (1974). He reported that, when the reading ability of second graders from a class emphasizing career education approaches was compared to that of second graders not involved in such an approach, the reading scores on the Cooperative Primary Reading Test were significantly higher, in a statistical sense, in the class using a career education approach in the classroom.

In Dade County (Miami), Florida, a letter from Dr. E. L. Whigham, Superintendent, Dade County Public Schools, to me provided data on results obtained from efforts to use a career education approach to teaching mathematics to 4th, 5th, and 6th graders at the Drew Elementary School. Comparing gain scores gained from data collected in 1973 and 1974, he reported mean gains (in the form of grade equivalents) for the 4th graders at + 1.96, for 5th graders as + 1.52, and for 6th graders as + 1.30. The conversations with Dade County career educational personnel made these gains seem even more impressive when they related that, among inner city elementary schools such as the Drew Elementary School, the average mean gain in mathematics achievement for the year was less than .50 when expressed in the form of grade equivalents.

A report on evaluation of career education efforts in Prince George's County, Maryland, showed similarly positive results. (Smith, 1974). There, when elementary school pupils who had been exposed to a career education approach were compared with pupils who had not been so exposed, the career education pupils scored significantly higher on both reading and mathematics scores in Grades 3 and 7 while, in the other elementary school grade where comparisons were made (6th graders), the "career education" pupils scored significantly higher on math but showed no statistically differences when compared with the control pupils on reading.

One study has come to my attention that failed to show any statistically significant differences between elementary school pupils exposed to a career education approach when contrasted with pupils who were not so exposed. This was reported in a Minnesota study (Smith, Brandon, 1974). When results from this study are studied, it can be seen that the career education "treatment" consisted of somewhere between one and two hours per week. This is far from what the concept of career education calls for.

These are all the results, related to the first criterion, that so far have been reported to USOE's Office of Career Education for elementary school pupils. It is, of course, negative and discouraging to see so few results available. On the other hand, it is positive and encouraging to see that, at least to date, the results do appear to support the rationale utilized in the formulation of the career education concept.

The Future of Evaluation of Career Education in Elementary Schools

On August 21, 1974, President Ford signed into law the Education Amendments of 1974–P.L. 93-380. Section 406, Title IV, is entitled "Career Education." The Congress, in its wisdom, chose to make this first piece of congressional legislation for career education, a *demonstration* act rather than a *program implementation* act. Thousands of school systems across the land feel that they have already demonstrated the viability and acceptance of career education in their communities. Many seem to feel the Congress erred in not providing the hundreds of millions of dollars required for implementing comprehensive career education programs throughout our nation. Personally, I understand and identify with the desire and commitment being expressed by such practitioners. At the same time, when I face the hard question of evaluation, it seems to me that the Congress acted wisely by asking that we demonstrate the effectiveness of career education prior to requesting large sums of money for its programmatic implementation. It should be obvious, from what has been said here so far, that we have yet to do so on a comprehensive and obviously clearcut scale.

The truth is, the so-called "demonstration" projects in career education funded from 1971-1974 were much more demonstrations of the struggle to develop and attain consensus on the career education concept than they were actual demonstrations of the effectiveness of that concept when applied in educational settings. Only now have we reached a point in time when the concept is sufficiently understood and a sufficient degree of consensus has been reached so that we are in a position to really test the viability of the concept through evaluation of results of demonstration efforts. In saying this, I have no intention of being either critical or lacking in appreciation of these earlier efforts. On the contrary, it seems to me miraculous that they were able to

advance the concept so far in so short a time. They deserve credit from all of us, not criticism from any of us.

Now, however, we must turn our most serious attention to problems involved in demonstrating and evaluating the effectiveness of career education.

To do so, it seems to me our efforts must be directed simultaneously in three basic directions. First, it will be essential that demonstration projects make clear the full career education concept, including its rationale, basic nature, and implementation strategies, that they are attempting to demonstrate. We can never really say how good career education is until and unless we are willing and able to define in specific programmatic terms what we mean when we say we are exerting a career education effort. We have now reached a point in time when we should be able to do this.

Second, we must devote serious and concentrated attention to the problem of constructing and validating assessment instruments and devices appropriate for use in the evaluation of career education. Much remains to be done before we will be able to say we have adequate devices available for measuring growth in such phases of career development as "career awareness," "career exploration," "career motivation," "career decisionmaking," and "career maturity." With all of our rhetoric about the nature and importance of work values, we still have far to go before we will be able to say we have reliable and valid instruments available for measuring the existence of such values—or the ways in which they change. Most instruments used, to date, in evaluation of the career development goals of career education are ones that were originally intended for other purposes. This is a serious problem.

Third, it seems to me we must all support and encourage efforts of the Education and Work Task Force of the National Institute of Education, as well as efforts of university researchers and those in other parts of society, to hasten the types of basic research whose results will be essential to the long run future of career education. I am speaking here about such matters as studying the basic nature of sex stereotyping in occupational decisionmaking, the viability of work experience as a supplement to classroom instruction, the use of performance evaluation, and various approaches being used for expanding educational opportunities for all persons. These, and many other segments of the career education concept are still based much more on philosophical belief than on hard evidence. One can reach the outer limits of utility for words alone in a very short while.

This article has attempted to take a positive, rather than a negative, approach to current problems facing our attempts to evaluate career education at the elementary school level. While I have tried to acknowledge that we still have a very long way to go, I hope I have also communicated my feeling that career

education has come a very long way in the last four years. We have moved from the "idea" to the "concept" stage. We have been able to maintain and expand the enthusiasm and support for career education essential for its continuance. We have attained a degree of consensus among career education leaders that allow us to talk about the topic in rather definitive terms. We have been able to identify at least some of the criteria appropriate for use in evaluating career education. In the few instances where the basic criterion of career education's effectiveness in increasing pupil achievement have been applied, we have found generally positive results.

At this point in time, I find myself feeling proud of career education's past achievements, more confident than ever of the need for career education, and eager to get on with the task of evaluation. I hope that you can share some of these feelings with me.

CAREER EDUCATION AND TEACHER EDUCATION

Career education is a young movement born of uncertain parentage and without the benefit of having teacher education as its midwife. In spite of this inasupicious beginning, the movement has continued to live and to grow. It seems safe to say that career education is stronger now than at any time in its brief history. Evidence justifying this statement is apparent in State departments of education, in local school systems throughout the nation, and in the United States Office of Education.

Evidence justifying an assertion that career education is a vibrant and growing movement would, it seems, be difficult to amass if one were to search for it among the teacher education institutions across the land. True, some outstanding exceptions would be found but, in general, it appears safe to say that the career education concept has met with less than enthusiastic acceptance and endorsement among faculty members in our teacher education institutions. That is why we are here. No call for educational reform can result in long-term change unless that call is heard and endorsed by our teacher education institutions. The leadership teacher education faculty members have traditionally provided the professional education community is needed no less by career education simply because the movement was not born in a teacher education institution. That leadership is sorely needed now in meeting inservice education demands, in further developing and refining the conceptualization of career education, and in producing and disseminating both basic and applied research germane to the testing and production of hypotheses related to career education. Above all else, the long-run future of career education will be directly dependent on the willingness and ability of teacher education institutions to change pre-service programs for educational personnel in ways that reflect the career education emphasis in American Education. It is primarily a concern for needed changes in pre-service programs in teacher education institutions that led to a call for this conference.

It would, in my opinion, be both unwise and unproductive for me to either attempt to "convert" members of this audience to the career education crusade or to specify, with any exactness, the detailed kinds of changes that are needed. You will either decide to work on this problem or you will decide to concentrate your energies on other matters. If any of you turn your attention to career education, the ideas you generate will be far better than any I could suggest in a general presentation such as this.

Thus, I see the primary purpose of this presentation as one of supplying background information upon which some of your decisions may be based. To do so, I must begin by presenting a very short synopsis of the current status of career education. Following this, I will attempt to outline those assumptions of career education which, to me, represent the greatest challenges for change in

teacher education institutions. Finally, I would like to dwell briefly on what seem to me to represent long-run implications for those teacher education institutions which decide to incorporate a career education emphasis into their undergraduate and graduate programs.

Current Status of Career Education

The current status of career education can be described from the local, State, and national levels. This ordering is indicative of a descending magnitude of activity.

At the local school district level, fewer than 500 of the 17,000 school districts in the USA have received Federal career education demonstration funds. Yet, more than 5,000 school districts have initiated some kind of career education effort. Most of these have operated with local funds with the blessing and endorsement of local boards of education. While a majority of such programs are pictured as "comprehensive" covering all grades K-12, in practice most activity has been generated at the K-6 levels with the least amount seen in the senior high school. Together, it seems obvious that these local efforts have generated hundreds of thousands of pages of material carrying such labels as "career education learning packages," "curriculum guides," and "resource guides." Unlike many other new and emerging movements in American Education, the vast majority of career education materials being used in local school districts is "homemade" by classroom teachers, not purchased from commercial publishers. Enthusiam seems high among those teachers who have tried a career education approach in the classroom. In almost every school, however, one has little difficulty finding teachers who could be described as either passive or as active resistors of career education.

It seems safe to say that the quantity of effort expended at the local school district level has exceeded the quality of that level by a very wide margin. Evaluation efforts, while generally yielding positive results, are found only infrequently and, by and large, are lacking in convincing quality. This lack of sound evidence of effectiveness has not seemed to dampen local enthusiasm for career education. It seems appropriate to say that, by and large, career education has been accepted on faith—and that an abundant amount of faith exists.

At the State level, more than 30 State boards of education have passed resolutions endorsing the career education concept and offering their own definitions of the term. Career education coordinators have been employed in 46 States—and many States have two such coordinators, one of whom reports to the State director of vocational education and the other to the assistant superintendent for instruction. Like local school systems, State departments of education have been busily engaged in the preparation and distribution of a wide variety of career education materials. The use of State funds received from the

Federal Government for career education has been common with such funds coming from Parts C and D of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 and from Titles I and III of ESEA. Ten States have passed some form of career education legislation (usually with multimillion dollar appropriations) and several others have such legislation under consideration at the present time. We do not have an exact count of the number of States that have held Governors Conferences on Career Education, but we suspect more than half of the States have been involved in such efforts. In general, it seems safe to say that State leadership in career education has been strong and is continuing to grow in strength at the present time.

At the Federal level, career education has received considerably more rhetoric than concrete action—at least to date. During the period 1971 through July, 1974, most Federal funds expended for career education in USOE came from the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968—a total of approximately $52 million. These funds were used primarily for purposes of establishing exemplary career education projects in local school districts (three in each State) and to develop career education curriculum materials. In addition, the National Institute of Education has spent approximately $15 million per year, each year since 1972, supporting basic research in career education.

On August 21, 1974, career education became a mandate of the Congress when President Ford signed into law P.L. 93-380—the Education Amendments of 1974. Section 406, Title IV, is entitled "Career Education" and authorizes $15 million per year for a three year period for purposes of demonstrating effective career education and assessing the current status of career education. In FY 75, the Congress appropriated $10 million for career education marking the first time any Federal monies had been specifically appropriated for this purpose.

In addition to funding authorization, Section 406 made two other significant provisions. One consisted in calling for establishment of a National Advisory Council on Career Education charged with assessing the current status of career education and with making recommendations to the Congress for future career education legislation. The second action called for establishment of an Office of Career Education whose Director is to report directly to the Commissioner of Education and work with *all* bureaus within OE as well as with other branches of government.

Actions of the Federal Government represent only a small portion of national level action affecting career education. At least as significant has been the large numbers of national organizations who have studied and endorsed the career education concept. These have included both professional education associations and associations outside the field of education. The diversity of organizations and associations voicing support for career education is perhaps best illustrated by a career education brochure recently published by the Chamber of Commerce

of the United States. Organizations formally participating in preparation of this brochure included:

American Association of School Administrators
American Personnel and Guidance Association
American Vocational Association
American Association of Community College Trustees
Bricklayers, Masons, & Plasterers International Union of America
Council of Chief State School Officers
Distributive Education Clubs of America
General Federation of Womens' Clubs
National Alliance of Businessmen
National Association for Advancement of Colored People
National Association of Elementary School Principals
National Association for Industry Education Cooperation
National Association of Manufacturers
National Association of Secondary School Principals
National Congress of Parents and Teachers
National Education Association (Consultant)
National Federation of Business & Professional Womens Clubs
National Manpower Institute
National School Boards Association
National Urban League
United States Office of Education
Vocational Industrial Clubs of America

This list can be considered indicative of the diversity of interest and the plurality of involvement of wide segments of both professional educators and the larger society in the career education movement. I know of no other national call for educational reform that has found such enthusiastic acceptance from such diverse segments of society in so short a time.

When one considers this combination of local, State, and national activity in career education, it seems appropriate to conclude that career education represents a topic that should be considered appropriate for discussion and consideration by teacher education institutions. This, of course, is not to say that it merits the endorsement and active involvement of such institutions. On the contrary, one could, if sufficiently opposed to the career education concept, contend that it represents a cause for concern and consternation. In any event, it seems safe to say that career education represents a topic that should no longer be ignored by faculty members in teacher education institutions.

The remainder of this presentation will be devoted to specifying a number of assumptions that seem important to consider as teacher education institutions

adopt positions and take actions—positive or negative—regarding career education. The specification of such assumptions here will hopefully raise many issues for consideration and resolution at this conference.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF CAREER EDUCATION

A variety of philosophical and programmatic assumptions of career education are found in USOE's official policy paper on career education entitled AN INTRODUCTION TO CAREER EDUCATION. No attempt will be made to review all those assumptions here. Instead, I will try to state and regroup some of these assumptions which appear to hold the most serious implications for decisions to be made by teacher education institutions.

Assumption 1: The Increasingly Close Relationships Between Education and the World of Paid Employment Should be Reflected in Educational Change.

It is fact, not assumption, that, increasingly, some set of learned occupational skills is a prerequisite to employment. It is fact, not assumption, that almost all persons—females as well as males—college graduates as well as high school dropouts—will be seeking paid employment at some time after leaving the formal educational system. It is fact, not assumption, that career education's emphasis on helping all students understand and capitalize on these relationships has struck a responsive chord among students, parents, and the general public. It is fact, not assumption, that American Education, as presently structured, is not designed to help all students do so.

It is assumption, not fact, that education, as preparation for work, should become a major goal of all who teach and of all who learn. It is assumption, not fact, that educators should be concerned about what students will do with the education they receive. It is assumption, not fact, that teachers should be concerned about motivating students to learn as well as being concerned about imparting instructional content. Career education makes each of these assumptions in its call for change.

It will be easy, and perhaps natural, for many teacher educators to react to these assumptions by saying each has been an inherent part of teacher education programs for years. To the extent this is so, the call for *change* is, of course, superfluous. Before rejecting this part of career education's call for change, I would hope that serious thought will be given to these assumptions. It is very obvious that some teacher educators may believe and operate as though what students choose to do with the education they receive is a matter that should be left to the student to decide. It is certainly a question worthy of discussion and resolution.

Assumption 2: The Word "Work" is a Viable one for use in the Conceptualization of Career Education.

"Work" is a four letter word—and is so regarded by large segments of American society. Yet, career education has made a basic assumption that "work" is a viable word to use in conceptualizing career education. I would like to tell you what we had in mind when we made that assumption and why we made it.

First, we wanted to find a word that would properly respond to society's call for educational change. That call appears to be two-fold in nature. Part of the call centers around relationships between education and work. The second part centers around making work a more meaningful part of the total lifestyle of all individuals. The word "work" obviously fits that requirement.

Second, we wanted to find a word that could properly be applied to all persons of all ages in all kinds of educational settings. No major call for educational reform should be applicable to only a portion of the student body or a single portion of the formal educational system. We believe the definition of "work" we are using meets this requirement.

Third, we wanted to find a word that would have developmental connotations consistent with the basic principles of human growth and development around which our educational system is structured. It should have developmental implications beginning in the elementary school and continuing through the entire system of education. We believe the definition of "work" we are using meets this requirement.

Fourth, we wanted to find a word that carried humanistic connotations. We did not want to conceptualize career education around simply a model of economic man. We wanted to avoid the necessity of asking American Education to devote a substantial portion of its energies to preparing students for the many kinds of dehumanizing conditions found in today's world of paid employment. Rather, we sought a concept that held positive potential for humanizing the work place both in the world of paid employment and in leisure time activities.

Fifth, we wanted a word that would be sufficiently narrow in meaning so as to assure that career education would be clearly pictured as only one part of American Education. At the same time, it must be sufficiently broad in meaning so that all educators and all students would be affected by application of the concept. We think this has been accomplished with the definition of "work" we are using.

To accomplish these purposes, we could not afford to adopt the popular meaning of "work" that, in the eyes of many, makes it synonymous with "labor." Instead, we had to re-define "work" as follows:

> "Work" is conscious effort, other than activities whose primary purpose is either coping or relaxation, aimed at producing benefits for oneself and/or for oneself and others.

This definition is intended to cover activities in the entire world of paid employment. It is also intended to include the work of the volunteer, the full-time homemaker, the *work* of the student, and work performed as part of one's leisure time. Its basic emphasis is on the human need of all human beings to *do*—to *accomplish*—to *achieve*. It is a concept that allows persons to see both *who* they are and *why* they are through discovering what they have *done*. Its emphasis on achievement is designed to meet both society's needs for productivity and the individual's need to find personal meaning and meaningfulness in her or his total life.

By focusing on achievement, career education obviously ignores such other important purposes of American Education as those concerned with helping individuals enjoy, appreciate, understand, and think about all of life and all of living. In this sense, it runs no risks of being considered synonymous with all of Education.

Certainly, the implications this assumption holds for balancing a "learning to do" with a "doing to learn" emphasis in American Education is one that will not find universal acceptance among American scholars. It does carry strong connotations supporting those who argue that an activity approach to the teaching-learning process has merit, that books represent only one of many learning tools, and that the classroom represents only one of several kinds of learning environments. We cannot and should not expect all faculty members in our teacher education institutions to support or to endorse this assumption.

Those who find they can endorse this concept will see immediately that we are talking about emphasizing a "success," rather than a "failure," approach in the classroom—an approach that helps the student see what she or he has been able to accomplish—not how they failed to accomplish. It asks that we emphasize helping students *do* before we urge them to "do better." These, and many other implications, will be obvious to those who attempt to change teaching methodology in ways consistent with this assumption.

Assumption 3: The Days of Educational Isolationism, Both Within and Outside of our Formal Educational System, are Past.

Two key words—"infusion" and "collaboration"—are inherent in the career education concept. We use the word "infusion" in several ways. Here, I am speaking about our attempts to eliminate false barriers at the secondary school level among things labeled "academic," "general," and "vocational." By "collaboration" I am referring to attempts on the part of the formal educational system to join forces with the home and family structure and with the business-labor-industry-professional-government community in a total career education effort.

Career education seeks to make education, as preparation for work, a major goal of all who teach and of all who learn. To do so demands that all teachers at all levels of education accept responsibility for equipping students with general career skills—including the basic academic skills of oral and written communication and mathematics, good work habits, and exposure to a wide variety of work values. It also asks all teachers to emphasize the career implications of their subject matter in terms of both paid and unpaid work. Finally, it calls for opening up the widest possible range of educational options to all students—to the elimination of "tracking" in narrow curricular areas, and the assignment of students to various "tracks" based on scholastic aptitude. In short, it aims to bring what have been called "academic," "general," and "vocational" educators together into a single family of professional educators who share the purpose of education as preparation for work.

By "collaboration" we mean, in part, utilizing the business-labor-industry-professional-government community as a learning laboratory that provides observational, work experience, and work-study opportunities for students—and for those who educate students—for teachers, counselors, and school administrators. It proposes to view work experience as an educational methodology available to all students rather than a special kind of educational program available to only selected students from vocational education. We also mean to encourage the use of personnel from the business-labor-industry-professional-government community as resource persons in the classroom. Finally, we intend to emphasize performance evaluation approaches that recognize students can and do learn outside the four walls of the school as well as within them.

In part, "collaboration" refers to involvement of the home and family structure in the career education effort. This involves helping parents reinforce the positive work habits and attitudes we seek to impart in the classroom through viewing the home as, in part, a work place. It also involves using parents as career resource persons in the classroom. Finally, it means involving parents

very systematically in the school's attempts to assist students in the career decision-making process.

To many of today's teachers, these kinds of changes seem both large and highly distasteful. A very great deal of inservice education in career education has already been aimed at helping today's teachers change in ways consistent with this assumption. The only hope for the long run, of course, is that current teacher education programs will change in ways implied in this discussion. When one considers that such change might involve such things as encouraging prospective vocational education teachers to learn something about elementary education, prospective counselors to learn something about vocational education, undergraduate teacher education majors to acquire some work experience outside the field of formal education, and bringing members of the business-labor-industry-professional-government community into educational methods classes as resource persons, it is obvious that career education is asking that the principles of "infusion" and "collaboration" be applied to teacher education as well as in local school districts. Faced with this magnitude of change, it is not surprising that a career education emphasis has not yet come to very many teacher education institutions.

Assumption 4: All Professional Educators are Key Functionaries in Implementation of the Career Education Concept.

From the beginning, career education has avoided asking to be established as a separate subject. Further, it has not asked for new physical facilities nor for any substantial increases in educational staff. Instead, it has proceeded under an assumption that each of today's professional educators has a key and critical role to play in implementing the career education concept.

We have asked elementary, middle school, junior high, and senior high teachers to reduce worker alienation in the classroom—their own as well as that of their students. To do so, we have encouraged teachers to use career implications of subject matter as one means of motivating students to learn more in school. More than this, we have asked teachers to consider changing the entire teaching-learning process through "inventing" new materials, new ways of using the total community as a learning laboratory, and new ways to use community resources as supplements to the teacher's efforts to help students learn. We have assumed that, if these things can be accomplished, both teaching and learning will be more appealing and classroom productivity—i.e., increased student achievement—will result. There is some evidence now accumulating that appears to be validating that assumption.

We have asked school counselors to provide a greater emphasis to career guidance, to share their expertise with teachers and become more involved in helping classroom teachers, to emphasize accomplishments as a means of student

appraisal and of increasing student self-understanding, and to become more involved in working with both parents and with members of the business-labor-industry-professional-government community.

We have asked curriculum specialists to encourage the development of teacher-made learning packages, teacher creativity in devising new and different ways of attaining curricular goals, and the use of a wide variety of kinds of curricular materials.

We have asked school administrators to recognize that educators cannot implement an effective career education effort unless both the home and family structure and the business-labor-industry-professional-government community are involved in that effort. Consequently, we have asked administrators to create conditions for teachers to use the community as a learning laboratory and to utilize persons from the broader community as resource persons in the schools. We have also asked school administrators to work with curriculum specialists and faculty members in broadening opportunities for all students to take advantage of the full range of educational offerings through eliminating curricular barriers that lock students into a narrow range of possible choices.

Note that we have NOT asked teacher education institutions to create a new graduate or undergraduate specialty entitled Career Education, to start awarding degrees in Career Education, and so to leave all other departments free to operate as they have in the past. On the contrary, we have asked for changes in every part of the teacher education institution that reflect a career education emphasis. This, of course, is not to say that the institution should not consider adding one or more courses carrying the words "career education." We are only saying that the addition of such courses bears little relationship to what we would regard as the teacher education institution's commitment to change called for by career education.

Long Run Implications of Career Education for Teacher Education

Finally, there are a few long-run implications of career education for teacher education that must be mentioned. While none can be fully developed in this presentation, I would hope that each might be discussed at some time during your deliberations at this conference.

It should be readily apparent that the examples of educational change discussed here logically lead to consideration of other related avenues to educational reform. Perhaps most obvious will be such concepts as the year-round school, an open-entry–open-exit approach to education, and various alternatives to use of the traditional Carnegie unit as a means of measuring and recording educational accomplishment. It should be equally obvious that, in many ways, career education can be used as a vehicle having great public support

for accomplishing some needed educational reforms that a good many educational leaders have championed for a good many years. It is certainly not correctly pictured as a set of radical ideas recently invented by a few educational "crackpots."

The emphasis on community involvement in the educational process found in career education is a good case in point. This emphasis, of course, is basic to the entire human services movement—and I consider career education to be a part of that movement. It is seen today in the emphasis on community schools and in the emphasis on continuing education. Similarly, career education's emphasis on reduction of racial and sex stereotyping in career choices represents only part of American Education's current commitment to open up full developmental opportunities for minority persons and for females. I see no basic ways in which the career education movement is inconsistent with other current calls for reform in American Education.

It seems to me particularly crucial that our teacher education institutions assume leadership responsibilities for placing career education in proper perspective for their current students and for keeping it in proper perspective for all of American Education. It is abundently clear that career education is currently extremely popular in both local school districts and in State departments of education. It is equally clear that its current level of popularity in such settings is so high as to make it certain that it will decline in popularity, to some extent, within a relatively few years. At the very least, it would seem that current students in teacher education institutions should be made aware of the career education concept. Hopefully, some teacher education institutions will choose to provide their students with career education competencies. In the long run, however, perhaps the greatest responsibility facing teacher education leadership personnel will be one of keeping career education in proper perspective, both now and in the future, as only one part of American Education and as only one, among several, possible vehicles for use in effecting educational change.

It is my hope that I have succeeded in convincing you that career education represents a topic that is crying for consideration by faculty members in teacher education institutions. I am painfully aware of the fact that the dedication of individual faculty members to their own professional specialties leaves little room or time for consideration of topics outside those particular specialties. It is because I believe the career education concept is one that holds potential for bringing greater meaning and excitement to each professional specialty that I urge its consideration. There is something in it for you—and you—and you— and for all of us.

REFERENCES

1. Olson, LeVene A. *A Study of Elementary and Secondary Career Education in Lincoln County*. Huntington, W. Virginia: Marshall Univ., 1974.

2. Pucinski, Roman *The Courage to Change: New Directions for Career Education*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

3. Purcell, Clifford (Editor) *Focus on Career Education*. Vol. 5; No. 2, 1974.

4. Rhodes, James A. *Vocational Education and Guidance: A System for the Seventies*. Columbus, Ohio: C. E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1970.

5. Smith, Brandon B. *A System for Evaluating Career Education in Minnesota:* 1972-73. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education, 1974.

6. Smith, Midge F. *Interim Study of the Effects of Career Education in the Prince George's County Public School System*. Upper Marlboro, Md.: Prince George's County Public Schools, 1974.

7. *An Introduction to Career Education: A Policy Paper of the United States Office of Education*. DHEW Publication No. (OE) 75-00504. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

8. Venn, Grant *Man, Education, and Work*. Washington: American Council on Education 1964.

9. Whigham, E. L. Personal letter to K. Hoyt, Office of Career Education, United State Office of Education. May 10, 1974.

OE 008 777

GPO 908-898